

REMARKS

Claims 11-43 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 11-43 were rejected. With this Amendment, Claims 11, 22, and 33 are withdrawn and Claims 12-18, 23-28, and 34-40 are amended. Accordingly, claims 12-21, 23-32, and 34-43 are at issue in the above-identified application.

In the May 6, 2004 Office Action, Claims 11-14, 22-25 and 33-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Letorey et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,521,445) in view of *Olsen* (U.S. Patent No. 5,463,932). Claims 15-19, 26-30 and 37-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Letorey* in view of *Olsen* and further in view of *Vanha* (U.S. Patent No. 4,980,540). Claims 20, 31 and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Letorey* in view of *Olsen* and further in view of *Abrams et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,739). Claims 21, 32 and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Letorey* in view of *Olsen* and further in view of *Burklin* (U.S. Patent No. 5,848,028). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art does not teach "formatting a state message" and "transmitting the state message from the network interface for reception by another device." In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that *Letorey* teaches the above limitations at col. 2, lines 30-54. However, upon a closer examination, it is evident that this is not the case. Specifically, *Letorey* teaches a controller for controlling a home apparatus. In *Letorey*, the user may set an "absolute time" (or a "relative time", depending on the application) that corresponds to a desired start time for the home apparatus. When the clock time coincides with the "absolute time" (or the "relative time"), the controller is set to an active state. (Col. 2, lines 30-43). In this active state, *Letorey* teaches that the controller sends information to the apparatus in order to start

that apparatus. (Col. 2, lines 31-32). However, *Letorey* does not teach or even suggest that any message may be transmitted from the home apparatus to any other device.

By contrast, amended Claims 12, 23, and 34 each require, among other limitations, "transmitting the state message from the network interface for reception by another device." For example, in one embodiment discussed in the present specification at pages 27-28, the coffeemaker may transmit various state messages to an intelligent controller, such as a ready state, a not ready state, a brewing state, or a coffee ready state. As a result, the state of the coffeemaker apparatus may be determined remotely.

As the cited references do not disclose or even suggest "transmitting the state message from the network interface for reception by another device," Applicant submits that Claims 12, 23, and 34, as well as dependent claims 13-21, 24-32, and 35-43 are in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is requested. Should the Examiner have any remaining issue, Applicant kindly requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned.

Dated: September 7, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Jordan A. Sigale

Registration No. 39,028

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

P.O. Box 061080

Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080

(312) 876-8000